

REMARKS

Claims 1, 14-21, 34, 44 and 46-50 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 18, 19, 20, 34, 44 and 46 have been amended as shown on pages 2-5 of the Reply. The below comments present in greater detail distinctive features of applicants' claimed invention over the cited art that were conveyed to the Examiner over the telephone on October 25, 2007.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection of Claims 1, 18-20, 34, 44 and 46

Claims 1, 18-20, 34, 44 and 46 are objected to. Claims 1, 18-20, 34, 44 and 46 have been amended herein to cure the minor informalities. Accordingly, it is requested that this objection be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 14, 16-18, 20, 21, 34, 44 and 46-49 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 14, 16-18, 20, 21, 34, 44 and 46-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross, *et al.* (U.S. 5,555,346), Kelts (U.S. 2001/0030667), Selker (U.S. 6,549,219) and Nielsen (U.S. 6,337,699). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reason. Gross, *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielson, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the claimed aspects.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (emphasis added).

The claimed subject matter relates to providing an interactive user interface associated with one or more prioritized items that come from various external sources. The priorities are automatically determined by a prioritization system or may be provided by a user. To this end independent claims 1, 34, 44 and 46 recite similar features namely: ***a user interface that comprises a plurality of colored wedges with one or more objects displayed thereon, the wedges represent one of a user context or a source of the emails, the emails are represented by the one or more objects which are displayed based on an assigned priority, the user interface provides feedback about one or more user actions relating to at least some of the one or more e-mails, the one or more user actions comprising a time of response to the at least some of the one or more e-mails, reading the at least some of the one or more e-mails, deleting the at least some of the one or more e-mails or ignoring the at least some of the one or more e-mails, the priorities system configured to adjust its decision making regarding the prioritization of one or more subsequently received e-mails based on the feedback about the one or more user actions.*** Independent claims 34, 44 and 46 recite similar features. Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielson, either alone or in combination, fail to teach such claimed features.

Gross, *et al.* relates to an event driven and conditional rule based mail messaging system wherein a rule mechanism having a “When-If-Then” condition is implemented. A repertoire of events considered to be significant events is defined upon which actions in the electronic mail messaging system are triggered. At page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner contends that Gross *et al.* teaches a user interface that provides feedback about user actions relating to at least some of the one or more e-mails. Applicants’ representative avers to the contrary. In accordance with the claimed invention, the user interface provides feedback to the priorities system regarding the actions taken by the user on the messages. It could be how fast a user responds or reads a selected notification, whether the message is deleted or saved etc. At the cited portions, Gross *et al.* discloses a rule being triggered when a new message comes in, a user takes an action on a message, a timer event or a tickler event occurs. The rule being triggered is not a feedback provided by the user interface to the priorities system. Hence, Gross *et al.* is silent regarding ***the user interface provides feedback about one or more user actions relating to at least some of the one or more e-mails, the priorities system configured to adjust its decision making regarding the prioritization of one or more subsequently received e-mails based on the***

feedback about the one or more user actions and also does not teach or suggest displaying email messages in accordance with their priorities and a user interface comprising the claimed patterns to display domains/sources of the email with object representing the email messages as recited in the subject claims. Kelts fails to make up for this deficiency of Gross *et al.*

Kelts relates to retrieving programming information and for generating an interactive navigation interface for displaying such programming information. A navigation interface utilizes a magnification feature along with a hierarchical protocol for the display of active map items and allows a user to make selections. Kelts discloses displaying categories and subcategories in accordance with a suitable prioritization metric, which can be based on frequency of item selected by a user or specific preferences entered by a user or service provider. Although Kelts refers to a set-top device for a television that works like a general purpose computer comprising additional software application such as email applications, it does not teach or suggest using prioritization schema to prioritize *subsequently received emails*, and hence is silent regarding *the priorities system configured to adjust its decision making regarding the prioritization of one or more subsequently received e-mails based on the feedback about the one or more user actions* and also does not disclose a user interface that arranges emails in accordance with their priorities in a map comprising a plurality of colored wedges as recited in the subject claims.

Selker discloses a graphical user interface with a plurality of pie menu levels concentrically arranged, with menu selections of greater importance located within the centre most section. The first pie menu comprises a first group of items and the second menu comprises a second group of items. However, Selker does not disclose *the wedges represent one of a user context or a source of the emails* as recited by the subject claims. The Examiner cites Nielson to compensate for the deficiencies of Selker.

Nielson relates to a visual presentation of an icon such that a user can visualize and distinguish icons based on their context and can classify them as to importance. However, Nielson is silent regarding disclose *the wedges represent one of a user context or a source of the emails* as recited by the subject claims.

In view of at least the foregoing it is clear that the cited documents alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims. Therefore, this

rejection should be with respect to independent claims 1, 34, 44, 46 and all claims that depend there from.

III. Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross, Kelts, Selker, Nielsen and Knowlton, *et al.* (U.S. 6,057,842). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 15 depends from claim 1 and as explained above, Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Knowlton relates to a visual link mechanism for identifying addresses of locations in a plurality of remote systems and does not remedy aforementioned deficiencies of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claim 19 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross, Kelts, Selker, Nielsen, and Simonoff *et al.*, (U.S. 6,078,322). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 19 depends from claim 1 and as explained above, Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Simonoff *et al.*, relates to a virtual machine or device that facilitates interoperability between two or more computers but does not remedy the deficiencies of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claim 19 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross, Kelts, Selker, Nielsen, and Peden (U.S. 5,615,325). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 19 depends from claim 1 and as explained above, Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Peden relates to a graphical viewer for displaying hierarchical datasets, but does not remedy the deficiencies of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

VI. Rejection of Claim 50

37 CFR 1.104 (c) (2) requires that the pertinence of each reference must be clearly explained and the particular part relied upon from a reference in a rejection must be designated as nearly as practicable. The Office Action summary sheet shows that claim 50 is rejected. However, neither does the Examiner point to nor can applicants' representative find where any of the cited references teach explicit training of priorities systems by rearrangement of display objects as recited in claim 50.

Claim 50 recites a transparent cover for the wedges and the display objects, wherein opening the cover allows the user to manipulate items positioned on the notification system, and put back the cover. This allows the user to override the automatic categorization provided by the system, or in a training scenario. None of the cited references teach nor suggest such claimed aspects. In view of at least the aforementioned, examination and allowance of this claim is requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP248US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731